

**REMARKS:**

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2 – 4, and 9 have been canceled, claims 1, 6, 10, and 13 have been amended, and claims 14 – 15 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 – 8, 10 – 15 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM AMENDMENTS:**

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of claims 2 – 4, to correct typographical errors, and to place the claim in preferred U.S. format for issuance.

Claims 6 and 13 are amended to correct typographical errors and/or to place the claims in preferred U.S. format for issuance. Claims 6 and 13 are not amended in any substantive way, and the claimed subject matter is not narrowed. In regards to the Examiner's objection to claim 13 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 13 is also amended to bring the claim into accordance with 35 C.F.R. §1.75 (c).

Claim 10 is amended to incorporate the features of claims 1 and 9 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions and place it into independent claim format. In accordance with Examiner's suggestions, claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

In the Office Action, at pages 2 – 4, numbered paragraphs 3 – 4, claims 1 – 6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Clement et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,577,099 (hereinafter "Clement"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

**Claim 1 Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

Claim 1 as amended in the relevant part recites: "reading out digital signal values from said memory after a storage time, said storage time being identical with said delay time, and for subtracting these time-delayed digital signal values from actual input digital signal values."

None of the prior art references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests at least this feature

of the present invention. The Examiner relies on Clement to teach this element when referencing prior claim 4 (Col. 14 Lines 1 – 31). Given the Clement reference does not directly disclose or suggest the use of digital signal processors to subtract the delayed signal from the current signal, and although not specified, the Examiner's rejection appears to be derived from the incorporated reference: MOTOROLA, INC., DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESSOR USER'S MANUAL 56156 (1992) (hereinafter "Motorola"). Based upon the best available version of the Motorola reference, recently obtained by Applicant, a copy of which is enclosed, the Clement reference teaches the use of an inductive amplifier to perform analog filtering of the noise from the desired tone signals and incorporates the Motorola reference to disclose that a "[d]igital signal processing may be used as an alternative method for subtracting from the input signal a time-delayed version of the input signal." The Motorola reference discloses a user guide for a digital signal-processing chip. The specifically cited portions of the Motorola reference disclose analog-to-digital section frequency response and DC gain. Therefore, neither the Clement reference or the Motorola reference teach the above feature of claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Dependents Of Claim 1

Claims 5 – 8 and 11 – 13 depend from claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1 plus additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 5 – 8 and 11 – 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Dependents Of Claim 10

Claims 14 – 15 depend from claim 10 and include all the features of claim 10 plus additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 14 – 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In the Office Action, at pages 4 – 6, numbered paragraphs 5 – 8, claims 7, 9, and 11 – 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Clement in view of Komninos et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,163,504 and Ott et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,452,397. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 7, 11, and 12 depend from claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1 plus additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 7, 11, and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Claim 9 is cancelled.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

June 22, 2005

By:



David M. Pitcher  
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Enclosure: Motorola Manual 56156